



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov

Jon Rubin, Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLemore, Vice Chair
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Ammiano
City and County of San Francisco

Irma L. Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Beall Jr.
Santa Clara County

Bob Blanchard
Sonoma County and Cities

Mark DeSaubnier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Pamela Torliatt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Shelia Young
Cities of Alameda County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

Andrew Fremier
Deputy Executive Director,
Bay Area Toll Authority

Therese W. McMillan
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

**Programming and Allocations Committee
November 8, 2006
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Committee members in attendance were Chair Haggerty, Commissioners Blanchard, Kinsey, Sartipi, Tissier, Young, Rubin, McLemore, Giacomini, Halsted, and Torliatt.

Steve Heminger, MTC, reported on the Transportation Bond results from November 7th. Mr. Heminger stated that all of the Infrastructure Bonds on the state ballot passed by comfortable margins. Proposition 1B passed by 61%, while Proposition 1A passed by 77%.

There were eleven local measures on the ballot for transportation statewide, five of them passed and six failed. The measures that failed had majorities, but fell short of the two-thirds vote needed to pass. The Bay Area measure that lost was the Sonoma-Marine Area Rail Transit (SMART) rail proposal which came in at 65%, just shy of the two-thirds requirement to pass.

Consent Calendar

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes of October 4, 2006 meeting as submitted.

The committee voted unanimously to refer the following resolutions to the full Commission for adoption.

- Allocation of FY 2006-07 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to various claimants in the region. MTC Resolution Nos. 3750, Revised and 3751, Revised.
- 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment 07-02. MTC Resolution No. 3755, Revised.

Regional Programming

The committee voted unanimously to refer the following resolutions to the full Commission for adoption.

- Regional Measure 2 (RM2) Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans. MTC Resolution No. 3789.

Andrew Fremier, MTC, reported that the item approves a cooperative agreement with the Department of Transportation (DOT) for the design and construction of the RM2 project that extends the HOV corridor in I-80 from Highway 4 to the Carquinez bridge. Mr. Fremier reported that the project is the only RM2 project that is sponsored by the DOT, and an allocation was made in January 2006 for right of way and preliminary design. Due to conflicts with the approved RM2 guidelines established in MTC Resolution No. 3636, MTC staff recommends approving the cooperative agreement, which allows a reimbursable basis and waives the overhead requirement.

- Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. MTC Resolution No. 3787

Therese Knudsen, MTC, reported on the low income component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. There are three funding programs within SAFETEA that are tied to the Coordinated Plan. 1) Job access reverse commute program which focuses on the transportation needs of low income populations, 2) a new program called the New Freedom program, which focuses on transportation of the disabled community, and 3) the Section 5310 program, a federal formula program focusing on elderly and disabled transportation needs. Starting in FY 2007 any projects funded through the three programs need to be derived from the Coordinated Plan. The purpose of the plan is to assess the needs of the three populations and come up with unified strategies to address them. In terms of the elderly and disabled component, a consultant has been hired to help with the in-depth planning and anticipates having a draft of this component ready in Spring 2007. The low income component has been reviewed by MTC's Minority Citizen's Advisory Committee, Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee, our Regional Welfare to Work Transportation Working Group as well as the Bay Area Partnership Board. A summary of their comments has been incorporated into the plan.

- BART's request for allocation of \$3.3 million in Regional Measure 1 Rail Reserve Funding for the BART San Francisco Airport Extension Project. MTC Resolution No. 3786.

Vince Petrites, MTC, reported on BART's request for \$3.3 million in RM1 Rail Extension Reserve funds for the final increment under this funding source for the BART to San Francisco Airport extension. In March of 1999 the Commission entered into an MOU with BART and Samtrans to fund additional costs of the BART SFO extension. Under the MOU, \$60 million was loaned from the East Bay extension rail reserve for this project and \$18 million was committed in West Bay extension reserves. The MOU was revised this June 2006 to amend the terms and extend the payback period. BART has already paid back \$13 million of the loan. BART and MTC have formed the San Francisco Bay Area Transit Financing Authority, which has issued revenue bonds back by MTC's commitment of bridge toll funds.

State Programming

The committee voted unanimously to refer the following resolution to the full Commission for adoption.

- Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Program Guidelines. MTC Resolution No. 3785.

Therese McMillan, MTC, reported that the three specific actions needed from the Committee are 1) Authorization by the Committee for the Call for Projects on November 13, 2006; 2) Referring the draft CMIA guidelines to the Commission for adoption, and acknowledging that there may be a need to amend any changes from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) or comments from the Committee; and 3) Request to the Commission to authorize a special Commission meeting on January 10, 2007 for the adoption of the CMIA.

MTC staff expects CTC to adopt the guidelines on November 8 or 9, 2006 at the CTC meeting in Jackson, CA. Staff does not anticipate any significant changes to the guidelines as submitted to the CTC on October 25th. All proposed projects must be submitted to MTC by CMAs, Caltrans, or MTC and all projects must be ready for construction by December 2012 as well as follow the guidelines of financial and project readiness. In addition, MTC requires that all CMIA projects from the Bay Area region conform to MTC's existing regional policy that was adopted with Transportation 2030, which requires all new major freeway projects include traffic operation system elements. The CTC guidelines state that projects should include improvements in congestion relief, connectivity, operational or safety improvement, and access to jobs, housing or commerce.

In respect to submittal targets, the \$4.5 billion by statute must be distributed on a North South split: 60% to Southern California and 40% (about \$1.8 billion) to Northern California. The statute also states that CTC must adopt some regional targets. MTC staff's memorandum to the Committee recommends the Bay Area target submittal be in the range of \$2 billion (10% above the entire \$1.8 billion that would be assigned to North). Several of the CMAs have suggested a more open-ended approach.

MTC staff observes that the decision on submittal targets does not need to be made immediately but must be settled by the January 15, 2006 submittal date. In addition, performance criteria is essential in determining competitive projects, and the best performing projects as a group may suggest a target range the Commission may want to consider.

There are clear synergies between CMIA, Trade Corridor Program, and the ITIP that MTC staff would want to reinforce in the target submittals.

Ms. McMillan stated that the ITIP should be a direct extension of the CMIA program. The final CTC decision on the CMIA is not going to match the regional submittal; there will be gaps and potential shortfalls. MTC staff would like the ITIP to reinforce delivery of the projects that they feel are most important to the region. The ITIP can be used for a broader range of projects than CMIA, such as transit.

In regards to Trade Corridors, state law does not assign a specific lead coordinating role to MTC to develop the program. It also does not establish any kind of geographic targets. Staff expects Southern

California to have the lead based on their scale and international trade. However, staff believes that major international corridors such as I-80 and Interstate 580 allows for a competitive position in advancing the projects.

Commissioner Blanchard reiterated concerns raised by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority regarding broader targets, and asked if the CMAs would be involved in further deliberations on this subject. Ms. McMillan confirmed there would be ample opportunity for such discussions.

Commissioner Kinsey stated that a constrained list is in the Bay Area's interest to be competitive.

Commissioner Kinsey asked whether HOV connectivity should be encouraged in evaluating projects; staff concurred that the focus on congestion relief would make HOVs a major focus area.

Commissioner Kinsey also asked how much TOS adds to the projects cost and if the CMAs are aware of those cost estimates. Albert Yee, MTC, stated that it is a very minor cost increment of 5-7% in cost, but depends upon the amount of infrastructure that needs to be incorporated. In addition, MTC staff is working in a series of sessions with the CMAs beginning on November 13th.

Mr. Heminger stated that the CTC would get projects from two sources; regional agencies and Caltrans. It's important for MTC and Caltrans to come to an agreement to what is submitted. Also, MTC is working closely with CTC members from the Bay Area.

Commissioner Torliatt asked how the projects are being ranked. Mr. Heminger stated that the projects would be ranked based on which has the most benefit for the Bay Area and some measure of geographic equity. However, he stated that this is not intended to be another STIP program, and performance of the projects in terms of congestion relief is an essential consideration.

Commissioner Haggerty suggested that HOV language include HOT as well. He also recommended that MTC staff be more aggressive and ask for more than \$500 million in the Trade Corridor program because by the year 2030, the containers moving out of the Port of Oakland will triple in number.

California Transportation Commission (CTC) Report

Ms. McMillan reported in October the CTC was working to develop the CMIA guidelines. The CTC also approved supplemental funds for Route 24 in Contra Costa, an additional \$13 million for road rehab, and Route 101 in Marin received an additional \$1.5 million for widening. There were also some requests for time extensions and she noted that the CTC is becoming stricter in regards to adhering to regional deadlines. Project sponsors are encouraged to work with MTC in order to follow those deadlines.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Chair Haggerty adjourned the meeting at 11:01 a.m.